

<b>REQUEST FOR COUNCIL ACTION</b> CITY OF SAN DIEGO				CERTIFICATE NUMBER (FOR COMPTROLLER'S USE ONLY)	
TO: CITY COUNCIL		FROM (ORIGINATING DEPARTMENT): CDBG/Economic Development		DATE: 10/18/2013	
SUBJECT: Community Development Block Grant – Application Review and Scoring Criteria					
PRIMARY CONTACT (NAME, PHONE): Amy Gowan, 236-6421			SECONDARY CONTACT (NAME, PHONE): Sima Thakkar, 236-5902		
COMPLETE FOR ACCOUNTING PURPOSES					
FUND					
DEPT / FUNCTIONAL AREA					
ORG / COST CENTER					
OBJECT / GENERAL LEDGER ACCT					
JOB / WBS OR INTERNAL ORDER					
C.I.P./CAPITAL PROJECT No.					
AMOUNT	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
FUND					
DEPT / FUNCTIONAL AREA					
ORG / COST CENTER					
OBJECT / GENERAL LEDGER ACCT					
JOB / WBS OR INTERNAL ORDER					
C.I.P./CAPITAL PROJECT No.					
AMOUNT	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
COST SUMMARY (IF APPLICABLE):					
ROUTING AND APPROVALS					
CONTRIBUTORS/REVIEWERS:		APPROVING AUTHORITY		APPROVAL SIGNATURE	DATE SIGNED
Liaison Office		ORIG DEPT.		Tomlinson, Tom	10/21/2013
		CFO			
		DEPUTY CHIEF			
		COO			
		CITY ATTORNEY			
		COUNCIL PRESIDENTS OFFICE			
PREPARATION OF:		<input type="checkbox"/> RESOLUTIONS	<input type="checkbox"/> ORDINANCE(S)	<input type="checkbox"/> AGREEMENT(S)	<input type="checkbox"/> DEED(S)
Accept the recommended review and scoring criteria as proposed in Attachment A.					
STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS: Approve the requested action.					
SPECIAL CONDITIONS (REFER TO A.R. 3.20 FOR INFORMATION ON COMPLETING THIS SECTION)					
COUNCIL DISTRICT(S):		All			

COMMUNITY AREA(S):	All
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT:	This activity will not result in a direct or reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment, and is not subject to CEQA pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15060(c)(2).
CITY CLERK INSTRUCTIONS:	

**COUNCIL ACTION**  
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY SHEET**  
CITY OF SAN DIEGO

DATE: 10/18/2013

ORIGINATING DEPARTMENT: CDBG/Economic Development

SUBJECT: Community Development Block Grant – Application Review and Scoring Criteria

COUNCIL DISTRICT(S): All

CONTACT/PHONE NUMBER: Amy Gowan/236-6421

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY OF ITEM:**

This item recommends changes to the existing review and scoring criteria used to allocate Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Approve the requested action.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF ITEM BACKGROUND:**

Beginning in 2012, the Consolidated Plan Advisory Board (CPAB) assumed responsibility to review and score the City's Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) applications and provide funding recommendations to City Council. In 2011, the Public Safety and Neighborhood Services (PS&NS) Committee approved a set of review and scoring criteria to guide CPAB's review of applications. The review and scoring criteria assign points to each category of review to facilitate standardized scoring across reviewers. After two years of implementing the approved criteria and point system, changes are being recommended in an effort to improve the process (Attachment A).

In June, 2013, staff presented an informational debrief to the PS&NS Committee regarding the Fiscal Year 2014 (FY14) CDBG funding allocation process. During the meeting, staff was asked to develop measures that facilitate a more objective scoring process. In response to this request, staff is proposing to assign a range of points to each criteria. Currently, the scoring criteria includes general categories with a qualitative listing of criteria captured within each category. However, it is difficult to determine the amount of points to assign and/or deduct from each category because the criteria is not quantifiable. For example, a certain project may satisfy one or more of the criteria, while not addressing others, and thus the overall score is subject to the interpretation of each rater. The proposed changes help to quantify and further standardize scores within each category. Additionally, a scoring tool (Attachment B) has been developed to create further definition and structure for scoring applications.

Other proposed changes are a result of the CPAB's request for staff to review certain technical components of the applications, such as; conformance with HUD regulations, eligibility of budget line items, financial management and audit standards, documentation of leveraged resources, etc. Beginning this year, the application process is transitioning into a two-phased Request for Qualifications (RFQ)/Request for Proposals (RFP) process. During the RFQ phase, staff will provide this technical review and "qualify" applicants that are eligible to proceed with the RFP phase. Since the proposed review and scoring criteria will only be applied to "qualified agencies" during the RFP review, certain line items were removed that are more appropriate to be considered during the RFQ phase.

Finally, as discussed at the September 18, 2013 PS&NS Committee meeting, staff has expanded upon two areas within the criteria in an effort to give more weight to proposals that 1) target resources to areas of economic distress and 2) demonstrate high leverage of funding and resources. These changes are being proposed in response to feedback received from Councilmembers, members of the CPAB, and other stakeholders to target CDBG funds to communities most in need.

FISCAL CONSIDERATIONS: No fiscal impact to the General Fund with this item.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY CONTRACTING INFORMATION (IF APPLICABLE): N/A

PREVIOUS COUNCIL and/or COMMITTEE ACTION (describe any changes made to the item from what was presented at committee):

On June 5, 2013, PS&NS discussed the scoring process for CDBG applications.

On September 18, 2013, PS&NS received an informational item regarding the review and scoring criteria associated with the Fiscal Year 2015 (FY15) application process.

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION AND PUBLIC OUTREACH EFFORTS:

On October 9, 2013, the Consolidated Plan Advisory Board held a publically noticed workshop to solicit input on the proposed review and scoring criteria.

All meeting minutes, notices and agendas were distributed via email to interested stakeholders and posted on the City's CDBG program website.

KEY STAKEHOLDERS AND PROJECTED IMPACTS: Residents of low and moderate income communities; community based organizations; community planning groups; and other community development organizations.

Tomlinson, Tom

Originating Department

---

Deputy Chief/Chief Operating Officer

**CITY OF SAN DIEGO  
CDBG PROGRAM  
CDBG APPLICATION SCORING CRITERIA  
FOR QUALIFIED AGENCIES**

The following table lists the maximum score an applicant can receive, along with the review criteria for each section. For these sections, we suggest a close review of your application response in regards to the review criteria below.

<b>MAXIMUM POINTS 100</b>	<b>APPLICATION REVIEW CRITERIA</b>
<p style="text-align: center;">15 10</p>	<p><b>1. RELATIONSHIP TO CONSOLIDATED PLAN GOALS</b></p> <p>(a) Proposed activity is consistent with the Consolidated Plan Goals and yearly Action Plan Goals approved by City Council [anticipating new preliminary Fiscal Year 2015-19 Goals] (0-5)</p> <p><del>(b) Activity/Project meets a high level ranked priority set by City Council for FY 2013</del></p> <p>(c) Proposed activity meets one or more priority levels identified in the Consolidated Plan (0-5)</p> <p><del>(d) Activity/Project addresses one of the unmet Consolidated Plan goals</del></p>
<p style="text-align: center;">20</p>	<p><b>2. PROJECT BENEFIT TO LOW AND MODERATE INCOME (LMI)</b></p> <p><del>(a) Activity/Project proposed to and program office is located in, and provides services and is accessible to LMI City residents within an eligible CDBG census tract</del></p> <p>(b) Activity targets direct services or improvements to underserved low income residents and areas*. *Methodology to determine areas will be developed in conjunction with the Consolidated Plan and RFP. Areas will be mapped and provided. Example of factors: - High % of the people served through the activity are very low income residents (&lt;50% AMI) City of San Diego residents - Located in or has a service area with high concentration of economic distress <del>- Activity/Project and services are accessible to City residents located within the highest LMI concentration census tracts</del></p> <p><del>(c) A high percentage of the people served through the activity/project are low income, City of San Diego residents</del></p>

20	<p><b>3. PROJECT OUTCOMES/EFFECTIVENESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Provides a clear description of each objective to be achieved and is consistent with the scope of the proposed activity (0-5)</li> <li>(b) Provides a clear description of the target population for each objective (0-5)</li> <li>(c) Provides a high benefit to the San Diego communities in relation to the amount of funds and type of service (0-5)</li> <li>(d) <del>Demonstrates how outcomes will impact the population and/or community affected by an unmet need</del></li> <li>(e) <del>Demonstrates that each objective can be achieved within the FY 2013 period</del></li> <li>(f) Each objective listed is supported by clear measurement methods and appear to be achievable (0-5)</li> <li>(g) <del>Applicant offers a new, needed or unduplicated service; access to an existing service by new clients who did not previously have access; or, if seeking increased funding, demonstrates that the increase is justifiable for the services that will be provided to LMI City residents</del></li> </ul>
----	--

20	<p><b>4. ACTIVITY/TIMELINESS</b></p> <p>(a) Provides a clear description of the scope of the activity, details the specific tasks to be accomplished in achieving the defined objectives, and demonstrates the appropriate level of licensing or site control ; <del>it is a well-defined project with an achievable implementation plan</del> (0-5)</p> <p>(b) The applicant clearly details how the proposed activity is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- a new service or improvement with documented need</li> <li>- not a duplication of existing services</li> <li>- an expansion of an existing service that increases access to services to previously underserved households or areas</li> </ul> <p>(0-5)</p> <p>(c) Project does not charge client fees or clearly provides proper justification for any client fees charged</p> <p>For CIP Projects, the factors will consist of the following as applicable (max 10 points):</p> <p>(d) Developer/construction manager to be utilized has previous development/construction experience with similar type construction activity funded with federal funds</p> <p>(e) Construction timeline and schedule well-documented</p> <p>(f) Construction is ready to start pending the selection and award of the general contractor within ninety (90) calendar days from the CDBG contract execution</p> <p>(g) Project scope addresses identified and documented health, safety, and/or ADA problems</p> <p>(h) Clearly demonstrates how the completed work will be maintained for a period of not less than five (5) years after termination of Agreement with the City</p> <p>For Direct Services Projects, the factors will consist of the following as applicable (max 10 points):</p> <p>(h) Demonstrates a clear alignment or connection between the needs identified and the intended objectives/results</p> <p>(i) Provides the number of unduplicated clients to receive each identified service</p> <p>(j) Annual cost per client is justifiable</p> <p><del>(k) Project scope addresses unmet needs and is not duplicative of other services</del></p> <p>(l) Demonstrates collaborative efforts with other service providers in the area to maximize benefit to clients served</p>
15	<p><b>5. ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY/CAPABILITY/TRACK RECORD</b></p> <p>(a) Identifies staff responsible for ensuring project oversight, management,</p>

	<p>fiscal oversight, and evaluation methods. If the staff identified was not included in the RFQ (in the same roles), <del>as well as what evaluation tools will be used</del> additional qualifications and justification is provided; and the Board of Directors includes diverse community representation.</p> <p>(0-5)</p> <p><del>(b) Demonstrates quality methodology and capacity to evaluate the success of the proposed project and whether each objective was accomplished</del></p> <p><del>(c) Demonstrates management and fiscal staff resources with skills, experience and/or appropriate credentials to administer and conduct an accountable and responsible project</del></p> <p>(d) Clearly demonstrates quality experience and accomplishments in providing services to LMI City residents and/or communities</p> <p>(0-5)</p> <p><del>(e) Fully describes evidence/documentation of acceptable and accountable agency's sound management and financial systems that minimize any opportunity for fraud, waste or mismanagement. Documents:</del></p> <p><del>- conflict of interest policy is enforced</del></p> <p><del>- well established sound fiscal management system</del></p> <p><del>- procedures ability to identify/track CDBG funds/clients assisted separately from other funding sources (0-5)</del></p> <p>(f) Provides confirmed evidence of successful past project performance or success in initiating, maintaining, and completing similar projects or projects of similar magnitude with CDBG funds and/or other funding sources; consistently met its program goals</p> <p>(0-5)</p> <p><del>(g) Demonstrates appropriate level of licensing or site control</del></p>
<p>10</p> <p>15</p>	<p><b>6. BUDGET JUSTIFICATION &amp; LEVERAGE OF FUNDS</b></p> <p>(a) Provides a budget that: <del>is clearly detailed</del></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- details all sources of funding for total activity costs</li> <li>- details all uses of funding for total activity costs</li> <li>- cost estimates are well documented</li> </ul> <p>(0-5)</p> <p>(b) The CDBG funds requested represents less than 50% of the overall total activity costs <del>budget and</del> and leverage of non-CDBG sources are documented and secured</p> <p>(0-5)</p> <p>(c) Proposed activity budget includes efforts to achieve program sustainability through documented leverage of non-CDBG resources</p> <p><del>(d) Provides secured documented funding from other sources to implement the project on July 1, 2012</del></p>



## CDBG Scoring Matrix and Evaluation Criteria

Category	Priority (weight)	0 points	1-2 points	3-4 points	5 points	Pts Possible
1. RELATIONSHIP TO CONSOLIDATED PLAN GOALS (10)	Consistent with the Consolidated Plan Goals 2015-19	No consistency			Consistent with Plans	5
	Priority level (s) Consolidated Plan	No identified need	Low priority	Medium	High	5
2. BENEFIT TO LOW AND MODERATE INCOME (LMI) (20)	Direct services (public services) or improvements	Activity targets direct services or improvements to underserved low income residents and areas such as: -high % of very low income (<50% AMI) -located in or has a service area with high concentration of economic distress				20
3. PROJECT OUTCOMES (20)	Objectives and proposed activity	Not clear or consistent			Clearly defined	5
	Target population	Not clearly identified		Clearly identified and defined		5
	Objectives and methods	Not clear or consistent defined			Clearly	5
	CDBG Cost/Benefit	High cost per proposed beneficiary			Low cost per proposed	5
4. ACTIVITY/TIMELINESS (20)	Defined and realistic scope of activity	Not clearly defined			Clearly defined	5
	Demonstrated need	Not clearly defined			Clearly defined	5
	CIP or Direct Services					10
5. ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY (15)	Appropriate staffing plans/Diverse Board of Directors	Capacity not clear			Capacity detailed	5
	Experience in activity	No prior experience			Experience detailed	5
	Sound management and financial systems	No prior experience			Experience detailed	
	Past performance	No evidence			Clearly detailed	5
6. BUDGET & LEVERAGE OF FUNDS (15)	Budget					5
	Diversification of funds	CDBG higher than 50%			CDBG funds < 50%	5
	Leverage	0% of budget from private resources		high %of budget from private resources		5

